

REMARKS

A telephonic interview was held on July 19, 2005 between Examiner Johnny Ma and Applicant's representative Jack Friedman. In the interview, agreement was reached as to features which upon being added to the claims by amendment would enable the claims to overcome the current prior art rejections.. Applicants have added such features by amendment herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-13, 15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Movshovich *et al.* (US 6,434,170 B1).

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 14, 16 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Movshovich *et al.* (US 6,434,170 B1) in further view of Temple *et al.* (US 2003/0147430 A1).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(c) and §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-13, 15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Movshovich et al. (US 6,434,170 B1).

Since claims 1-5, 7-10, and 18 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not anticipate claim 11, because Movshovich does not teach each and every feature of claim 11.

As a first example of why Movshovich does not teach each and every feature of claim 11, Movshovich does not teach the feature: "wherein the bypassable synchronizer and the bypassable packet parser respectively synchronize and filter the first type transport stream data before passing the first type transport stream data to the packet buffer, wherein the bypassable synchronizer and the bypassable packet parser deliver second type transport stream data to the packet buffer without synchronizing and filtering, respectively, the second type transport stream data, ... , wherein the second type transport stream data comprises non-MPEG-2 data".

Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not anywhere disclose a capability of selectively bypassing and synchronizing and parsing the second type transport stream data (comprising non-MPEG-2 data), but synchronizing and parsing the first type transport stream data (comprising MPEG-2 data).

As a second example of why Movshovich does not teach each and every feature of claim 11, Movshovich does not teach the feature: "wherein the bypassable packet parser comprises a

packet identifier (PID) filter”.

The Examiner alleges that the packet framer 302 of Movshovich is a packet parser (see Examiner's analysis of claim 20). In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not teach that the packet framer 302 comprises a PID filter.

As a third example of why Movshovich does not teach each and every feature of claim 11, Movshovich does not teach the feature: “wherein the other transport stream data comprises non-MPEG-2 data, ..., wherein the other transport stream data outputted by the data unloader has not been synchronized and filtered by the bypassable synchronizer and the bypassable packet parser, respectively, and is transmitted concurrently in real time from the data unloader to the system memory and to the string comparator”.

Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 11 with respect to the other transport stream data comprising non-MPEG-2 data which is not synchronized and filtered by the bypassable synchronizer and the bypassable packet parser, respectively, and which is concurrently transmitted in real time from the data unloader to the system memory and to the string comparator.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Movshovich does not anticipate claim 11, and that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 12-13, 15, and 17-18 depend from claim 11, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 12-13, 15 and 17-18 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 14, 16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Movshovich et al. (US 6,434,170) in further view of Temple et al. (US 2003/0147430).

Claims 6

Since claim 6 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is moot.

Claims 14, 16, and 19

Since claims 14, 16, and 19 depend from claim 11, which Applicants have argued *supra* to be not anticipated by Movshovich under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants maintain that claims 14, 16, and 19 are likewise not unpatentable over Movshovich in view of Temple under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 20-21

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 20 is not unpatentable over Movshovich in view of Temple, because Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 20.

As a first example of why Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 20, Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest the

09/660,867

11

feature: "wherein the bypassable synchronizer and the bypassable packet parser deliver the alternative transport stream to the packet buffer without synchronizing and filtering, respectively, the non-MPEG-2 data of the alternative transport stream"

Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not anywhere disclose a capability of selectively bypassing and synchronizing and parsing the alternative transport stream data (comprising non-MPEG-2 data), but synchronizing and parsing the MPEG-2 transport stream.

As a second example of why Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 20, Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the bypassable packet parser comprises a packet identifier (PID) filter".

The Examiner alleges that the packet framer 302 of Movshovich is a packet parser. In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not teach that the packet framer 302 comprises a PID filter.

As a third example of why Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 20, Movshovich in view of Temple does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein non-MPEG-2 data outputted by the data unloader is transmitted concurrently in real time to the system memory and to the string comparator".

Applicants respectfully contend that Movshovich does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 20 with respect to the non-MPEG-2 data being transmitted concurrently in real time to the system memory and to the string comparator.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 20 is not unpatentable over Movshovich in further view of Temple, and that claim 20 is in condition for allowance. Since claim 21 depends from claim 20, Applicants respectfully contend that claim 21 is likewise in condition for allowance.

09/660,867

13

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 07/22/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

09/660,867

14